

REMARKS

Claims 50-54, 56-63, and 65-71 remain in this application. Claims 50, 54, 57, 60, 63 and 66 have been amended. By these amendments, no new matter has been added. Reconsideration and review of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 50 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as indefinite. These rejections are respectfully traversed. Claims 50 and 60 have been amended to delete "quickly," as suggested by the Examiner, and are believed to be sufficiently definite. These rejections should therefore be withdrawn.

Claims 50-53, 60-62, 68-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Weinberg et al. (US 6,237,006) in view of Bloomberg (US 5,765,176), and Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Weinberg, Bloomberg, Astiz, and further in view of Sitka (US 6,330,572). All of these rejections are respectfully traversed.

Weinberg remains deficient in that it discloses a fundamentally different database management method from the Web page information assessment method recited in Claim 50. Weinberg discloses a diagnostic tool to be used by a Webmaster in evaluating the performance and effectiveness of Web sites. The diagnostic tool of Weinberg shows the relationships between interlinked web pages using star or tree-type diagrams, but does not provide a preview of the displayed content of the web pages. See, e.g., Figs. 1-6. According to Weinberg, each content object (HTML documents, GIF files, etc.) of the Web site is represented as a node on the star or tree diagram. Col. 2, lines 10-48. Each of the nodes is represented with an icon, rather than as an actual block of text or reduced-size image from the target pages or linked related pages. *Id.*

It is acknowledged that Weinberg fails to teach or suggest the elements of (a) automatically selecting "a block of text from at least one of the target pages or the linked related pages having text" and "an image file from at least one of the target pages or the

linked related pages displaying an image;" and (b) "generating a reduced-size image from the selected image file" as defined by claims 50 and 60. Furthermore, Weinberg fails to disclose a method that involves generating map information for the target pages and each set of linked related pages, wherein the map information comprises "the block of text, the reduced-size image, and a descriptor of selected pages from each set ... such that a user can quickly preview and assess informational content of the hyper-linked pages by viewing the map information," as recited in claim 50, and similarly defined in claim 60.

Bloomberg does not make up for these deficiencies of Weinberg. Bloomberg merely discloses providing iconic rectangular blocks of illegible "greeked text," as in a thumbnail image. Col. 5, line 63 – col. 6, lines 24. The text itself is not provided; just a graphical representation of text that is not readable. Fig. 3; col. 11, lines 5-7. "Text" cannot reasonably be construed to include an illegible graphical representation meant to resemble text, such as "greeked text." The term "text," according to its ordinary meaning includes "words treated as data by a computer," cannot made to include wordless things. The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition, 2000. Bloomberg therefore fails to disclose or suggest the step of automatically selecting generating the map information "comprising the hyperlink, the block of text, the reduced-size image, and a descriptor of selected pages from each set, for each of the plurality of target pages, such that a user can preview and assess informational content of the target pages and the linked related pages by viewing the map information," as defined by claims 50 and 60. Failing to disclose every element of independent claims 50 and 60, the combination of Weinberg and Bloomberg fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Claims 50 and 60 are therefore patentable. The remaining claims are also patentable, at least as depending from an allowable base claim.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 50-54, 56-63, and 65-71 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested, and a timely Notice of Allowability is solicited. If it


Serial No. 10/414,634  
June 9, 2006  
Page 9

would be helpful to placing this application in condition for allowance, Applicants encourage the Examiner to contact the undersigned counsel and conduct a telephonic interview.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition the Commissioner for a one-month extension of time, extending to June 26, 2006 the period for response to the Office Action dated January 24, 2006. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-3683.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 9, 2006

  
Jonathan Jaech  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 41,091

CUSTOMER  
NUMBER

**58688**

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

**Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz LLP**  
P.O. Box 2207  
Wilmington, DE 19899  
(213) 787-2500